However, I am reverting to precedent: I beg pardon. But, with regard to the mountain-stream which is proposed for our imitation, I cannot but think it a very unfortunate emblem of freedom, since all the broil and tumult we admire is but the poor thing's vain vapouring after a freedom it has not, and cannot obtain. To my notions, the freer stream is the "father of waters," enriched with the tribute of a hundred such gullies, wandering the plains "at his own sweet will," not just where the rocks oblige him, and through many a wide fertile tract, that laughs to scorn the torrent's poor sterile nook.

But, to the main point: Mr. Kerr thinks, that in the streets of an English or American town that attempts no ornament—no vestige of the "styles of architecture"—we shall see a style appearing—(we shall, indeed, and a perfectly *new* style, too, but, as I mean to show, not a style of *architecture*, nor ever capable of becoming one)—a "natural style" he proceeds (I hope to prove it must *unnatural*), "in its elements, at the least, its principles, based on pure construction." There's the point—*pure construction?* Nay, think again, mine ancient. Four letters make all the difference. Look a little closer, good Mr. Newleafe, and say whether you should not, for *pure* construction, have written *sham* construction. Make that little change, and the whole reads right. Based on sham construction is the style in question, as its fundamental principle and all pervading rule; from the sham plinth that is not the foundation, to the sham coping that is not the covering; from the "Flemish bond" without, to the last fittings and furniture within.

If there be any rule essential to this "style," lying at its very root, deeper and more permanent than all fashions, and paramount to all fancies, it is this rule, that *whatever is constructed must appear to be either constructed in a different manner or not constructed at all.* If neighbour Newleafe can find any exception thereto, any one part of this Anglo-American *plain* building-style, which is both made *of* what it pretends to be and constructed *as* it pretends to be, let us take that as a feature towards our "natural" style. But at present having, I confess, discovered no such feature, I conclude, that if the style in question be indeed a natural one, it can only be so where falsehood and deceit are natural—nowhere else.

When our friend referred us to the conventicles (against which ancient and even apostolic term I cannot conceive what objection he has) of such Dissenters as are too poor to afford *ornaments*, he stopped one step short of the mark: if he could but have descended one grade lower, to such as were too poor to afford *counterfeits*, he might have found what he sought. But, alas! there are *none* so poor as that in all her Majesty's dominions, with Yankee-land into the bargain. As in all secular edifices, from the palace and prison (or, rather, prison and palace) down to the "selling-off" shop; so in the temples of all sects, from Rome to Philadelphia, there is not one that, on Anglo-Saxon ground, is either rich enough to afford *realities* in design and construction, or poor enough to dispense with *fictions;* for with our race (but no other at present), ART (*i.e.*, deceit) is far more important than ornament,—is indispensable, even where ornament is not thought of. *Pretence* there *must* be, whether *pretension* or no.

Well and pertinently asked one of your correspondents lately,—"which of the styles of architecture was founded on deceit?"—not one: so that if our friend can make one out of the elements he expects, he will not only prove himself a genius, but also prove (which he has not yet done) precedent a liar.

This is far indeed from being the only difference of principle between the styles of old and that which Mr. Newleafe recommends to our study, and which I have long been studying, with a view to eliciting its principles. Perhaps you will allow me to attempt, in another letter, some elucidation of these principles, which will show their perfect *contrariety* to those acknowledged common to the architectural styles, both in this and in other no less important aspects. Indeed, like antipodes, they must be viewed from more points than one, before we see how thoroughly opposite they are. I hope, also, shortly, to prove the impracticability of following Mr. Scott's advice, "to begin where we left off," for a very simple reason, that seems to have been overlooked by his adversaries, viz., that *we never left off;* but, from the earliest times to the present, have proceeded in one constant direction, along a course that, before the Edwardian era, led to continually increasing truth; and ever since, to continually increasing falsehood; a course unbroken, and, in a certain sense, natural. Whether the result to which it has brought us be (like other styles, and as Mr. Kerr supposes it) natural to, and indicative of, the sympathies and tendencies of the age and nation of its production, we can never know;—I hope and pray Heaven it be not. If I fully believed it were so, I should bear with shame and grief the name of Englishman, and covet greedily any other under the sun, except American.

If Mr. Kerr "for one" can see "that the Gothic churches, one and all, and the Houses of Parliament, with all their grandeur," sink in the estimation of Englishmen beside the "preaching-room of Mr. Pugin's wrath, and the comfortable" arrangements of the bricklayers; I for one can see that John Bull's antipathy is not against the *magnificence* of the former, but against their superfluous and false pretences, their *mimic nature*, and their monotonous repetition of one uniform character (with all their variety of style)—the one broad character of COUNTERFEITS. He is already beginning to let the architects know that if this be all they can give him, he can dispense with their services, and he is quite right. If this be architecture, from architects deliver us, cry I, as heartily as any layman. But good Mr. Bull must likewise be taught that his fancied refuge from them is no refuge,—that if they only give him that,

> "Which, look'd on as it is, is naught but shadows
> Of what it is not,"—

the "practical" men give him worse,—shadows of shadows, counterfeits of counterfeits, three or four deep,—that their "*economy*" is but economy of thought,—their "*common sense*" monkey or parrot sense,—their "*simplicity*" that which (as Sir Joshua Reynolds said) sought to evade all the difficulties of art,—their "*comfort*" conformity to an irrational routine,—their "*cheapness*" mere trashiness, costing perpetual repair, and their "*plainness*" odious pretence, more barefaced than that of Greek or Gothic mimicry. Whatever hindrance to true architecture may arise from the old styles (and no doubt there will still be much), our national temperament insures far more from this new one, which I hope Mr. Pugin will not relax in his efforts to expose:—I, for one, wherever I meet with it, "*persequar et impugnabo,*" more than Mr. Pugin has done,—in more places and for more reasons. If he have made it a matter of religion, and you a matter of taste, I am resolved to make it a matter of *both*, and more than both. I will attack it not only on Catholic grounds but on Protestant ones too,—not only on grounds of Christian, but also of moral and social faith,—not only in the church and conventicle, but in the dwelling-house, the barrack, the factory, the warehouse, the exhibition-shed, the very stable; and not only because it is *unprecedented*, but because it is *deceitful;* and we have no need of deceit anywhere. I will attack it because it is not one of those things it pretends to be; not natural, not economical, not cheap, not comfortable, not salubrious, not "common sense," not simple, not plain, and not honest.

E. L. GARBETT.

P.S. I observe a suggestion from another of your correspondents, respecting the danger to St. Stephen's, Walbrook, if a fire were to happen in the adjoining house. May I suggest, if not too late, a method of obviating the danger more cheaply than by removing the house, as he proposes. Suppose Wren's design, now that it has become so famous, were, at length, to be (like innumerable foreign ones that deserve it incomparably less), carried out in *real* instead of *sham* construction? Suppose its beautiful arches, entablatures, coffers, vaults, and dome were to be made in reality what they pretend to be. The cost would be less than that of a house in such a locality, and the gem would be safe, not only from its neighbour's kitchen, but from all other sources of fire, and not only from fire, but from decay and periodical patching. The parishioners might also worship in a church, instead of a sham church, and leave the improvement of the street for "another time."

EMPLOYMENT FOR THE THAMES TUNNEL.

AFTER all the high aims and expectations with which it was undertaken—the inexhaustible skill and indomitable courage and perseverance of its engineer—the well-proved energy of its directors—the considerate sympathy and efficient aid of the government—the great outlay involved in its performance—this renowned subaqueous connecting-link of the shores of Middlesex and Surrey is, after all, only a penny pathway for foot-passengers,—with, to be sure, sundry stalls for the sale of stale gingerbread, and a dancing saloon for the *elite* of Rotherhithe and Wapping. With its European fame,—to think of its undeveloped utility! With such noble efforts,—to think of the base uses!

The formation of a tunnel across the bed of the Thames had been a vexed question for at least a quarter of a century before it was in good earnest set about; for its desireableness had become more and more obvious with the increased commercial importance of the opposite counties and their shores, and, so far as passenger traffic was concerned, the increased danger of ferrying on a river becoming more and more crowded with shipping and small craft. It was with anticipations beyond the mere obtaining a substitute for a passenger-bridge that the Thames Tunnel was commenced, and that coffers were (in whatever sense of the term) drained in its execution. What pity, then, that its dignity should so dwindle; its utility have such near limits; and its cost be met by so small a recompense.

It is stated that, in the week ending March 31, 1849, the number of persons who passed through was 43,764,—very satisfactory, certainly, as evidence of its usefulness in that way, but which would only bring to the exchequer, in pence, the sum of 182*l.* 6s. 9d.; and which, multiplied by 52, gives, for a year, 9,481*l.* 11s.,—an amount that, after expenses were paid, would be about two per cent. return on the cost, taking that at no more than 446,000*l.*

To render the Thames Tunnel more available, it appears that in 1845 (when active minds were very busy), there was a proposition for transforming it into a railway tunnel for connecting the lines north and south of the river; but nothing came out of it, probably either from the plan not being sufficiently matured, or its not having in view the preserving the independence of the tunnel. There is a way, however, in which it could be enhanced as a boon to the neighbourhoods it connects, and at the same time increased in its revenue,—namely, establishing in it a goods-conveyance, on a line of rails, *circulating* in the two channels, one of these being devoted to the southward, and the other to the northward traffic, between the opposite shores; having a pair of lifts in the shaft at either end, worked by hydraulic pressure, or by stationary steam engines of adequate power.

To such a purpose the present termini are capable of easy adaptation: carts with goods would be backed in at the level of the street till the lift was loaded with their contents, and these would be lowered directly upon the trucks: the latter might be either drawn by the engines or by horses: the downward incline in the tunnel, from the ends to the centre, could be overcome by making the rails more nearly, if they could not be altogether, horizontal: if the latter could have a slight *decline* in the direction of the journey so much the better. The body of the truck might be moveable upon its carriage, being a tray of thin iron, and having small wheels and guide-rails, so as when charged at the street level at one end it might be with facility run off sideways on to the lift, lowered, run on the truck-carriage, conveyed through, run on to the other lift, raised, and run off at the street level on the opposite shore, and loss of time in loading and unloading be thus much obviated.

The ingress and egress at each end for passengers would, as far down as the middle landing, continue nearly as at present, but from that level, an open cylindrical iron stair *of two spirals*—one for those coming, the

To learn about PDF Compression and OCR go to our website